REMARKS

The Applicants would like to thank the Examiner for the quick and courteous final Office Action.

The Applicants also greatly appreciate the Examiner's indication that claims 11 and 12 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claims 1, 3-7, 10, 12 and 14-33 are pending in the application.

Claims 1, 3-10 and 14-32 are rejected.

Claims 1, 3-5, 10, 12, and 19 are amended. It is respectfully submitted that no new matter is added. Dependent claim 33 is new; however this claim essentially restores language of original claim 2, which was previously added into independent claim 1, but is now canceled therefrom.

Claims 2, 8-9, 11 and 13 are canceled.

35 U.S.C. §112, Second Paragraph, Rejections

The Examiner has rejected claims 3-5 and 19-32 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as allegedly being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

The Examiner finds that claims 3-5 are dependent on canceled claim 2. In order to further examine claims 3-5, Examiner will interpret claims 3-5 as dependent on claim 1.

The Applicants appreciate the Examiner pointing out this concern. The Applicants respectfully direct the Examiner's attention to the amendments to the claims herein. Independent claim 1 has been amended to remove the original dependent claim 2 language. This language has now been restored in dependent claim form in new dependent claim 33. This new independent claim does not increase the number of claims originally paid for since claims have been canceled. Thus, the dependency of dependent claims 3-5 has been changed from "2" to "33" to essentially restore the original claim structure in this regard.

The Applicants respectfully submit that these amendments overcome the Examiner's rejections. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

35 U.S.C. §103(a) Rejection

The Examiner has rejected claims 1, 3-5, 8, 9, 19-21, and 26-32 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Mims (U.S. Patent No. 4,707,277) in view of Evans (U.S. Patent No. 2,010,538) for reasons of obviousness, for the reasons set out in the December 13, 2010 final Action.

The Applicants respectfully traverse. The Applicants submit that it is the Examiner's burden to establish a case of *prima facie* obviousness of the pending claims. *In re Oeticker,* 977 F.2d 1443, 1445; 24 U.S.P.Q.2d 1443 (Fed. Cir. 1992), and that as will be established, a *prima facie* case of obviousness of the amended claims has not been made herein.

The Applicants respectfully direct the Examiner's attention to the fact that independent claims 1 and 19 have been amended to recite the language of claim 11, indicated by the Examiner himself to be allowable over Mims and Evans as outlined in section 23 on page 8 of the December 13, 2010, final Office Action. Support for these amendments may be found in claims 8, 9 and 11 of the application as originally filed, and elsewhere, and thus do not constitute improper insertions of new matter. Dependent claims 8, 9 and 11 have been deleted as redundant.

The Applicants respectfully submit that with these amendments, the amended claims are allowable over Mims in view of Evans as already acknowledged by the Examiner. Thus, a *prima facie* case of obviousness of the amended claims has not been made, and the Applicants respectfully submit that the instant rejection must be withdrawn. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

35 U.S.C. §103(a) Rejection Over Mims in view of Evans and Young, et al.

The Examiner rejected claims 6, 7, 10, 14-17, and 22-25 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Mims (U.S. Patent No. 4,707,277) in

view of Evans (U.S. Patent No. 2,010,538) and in view of Young (U.S. Patent No. 5,098,667) for reasons of obviousness set out in the December 13, 2010 final Office Action.

Again, the Applicants respectfully traverse. The Applicant submits again that it is the Examiner's burden to establish a case of *prima facie* obviousness of the pending claims. *In re Oeticker, id*, and that as will be established, a *prima facie* case of obviousness of the amended claims has not been made herein.

The Applicants again respectfully direct the Examiner's attention to the fact that independent claims 1 and 19 have been amended to recite the language of claim 11, indicated by the Examiner himself to be allowable over Mims and Evans as outlined in section 23 on page 8 of the December 13, 2010, final Action. As previously noted, support for these amendments may be found in claims 8, 9 and 11 of the application as originally filed, and elsewhere, and thus do not constitute improper insertions of new matter.

Thus, the Applicants again respectfully submit that a *prima facie* rejection of the amended claims over the references has not been established, as previously recognized by the Examiner's indication of allowability, and that the rejection should be withdrawn. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

35 U.S.C. §103(a) Rejection Over Mims in view of Evans, Young, et al. and Gomi, et al.

The Examiner rejected claim 18 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Mims (U.S. Patent No. 4,707,277) in view of Evans (U.S. Patent No. 2,010,538) and in view of Young (U.S. Patent No. 5,098,667), and further in view of Gomi (U.S. Patent No. 5,796,012) for reasons of obviousness set out in the December 13, 2010 final Office Action.

Once more, the Applicants respectfully traverse. Again, the Applicant submits that it is the Examiner's burden to establish a case of *prima facie* obviousness of the pending claims, *In re Oeticker, id*, and that as will be established, a

prima facie case of obviousness of the amended claims has not been made herein.

The Applicants once more respectfully direct the Examiner's attention to the fact that independent claim 1 has been amended to recite the language of claim 11, indicated by the Examiner himself to be allowable over Mims and Evans as outlined in section 23 on page 8 of the December 13, 2010, final Action. As previously noted, support for these amendments may be found in claims 8, 9 and 11 of the application as originally filed, and elsewhere, and thus do not constitute improper insertions of new matter.

Thus, the Applicants again respectfully submit that a *prima facie* rejection of this claim, dependent on an amended base claim, over the references has not been established and that the rejection should be withdrawn. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Request for Entry of Amendment

The Applicants would respectfully request that the instant Amendment be entered under 37 CFR §1.116(b): "Amendments presenting rejected claims in better form for consideration on appeal may be admitted." It is respectfully noted that the only amendments to the claims are amendments to independent claims 1 and 19 to incorporate the language of dependent claim 11 (which also include the language of intervening dependent claims 8 and 9) that the Examiner kindly indicated was allowable. It is the Applicants' intent to only conform the claims to language that the Examiner has previously, consistently and repeatedly indicated was allowable. The Applicants respectfully submit that no other issues remain. It is respectfully submitted that for all of these reasons, which simplify and narrow the issues, and place the claims in better form for consideration on appeal, the instant Amendment should be entered. Such entrance is respectfully requested.

It is respectfully submitted that the amendments and arguments presented above place the claims in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and allowance of the claims are respectfully requested. The Examiner is respectfully reminded of

his continuing duty to indicate allowable subject matter. The Examiner is invited to call the Applicants' attorney at the number below for any reason, especially any reason that may help advance the prosecution.

Respectfully submitted,
James Edward Delves, et al.,

/David L. Mossman/

David L. Mossman
Registration No. 29,570
Attorney for Applicants
Telephone No. 512/219-4026
Facsimile No. 512/219-4036

Mossman, Kumar & Tyler
P. O. Box 421239
Houston, Texas 77242
E-mail: dmossman@mktlaw.us.com